

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 10, and 14.

Figures 1A and 2 have been modified to include the proper cross-hatching. Thus, Applicant requests withdrawal of the drawing objections. Figure 3 was modified to include the proper boundaries for the outer jacket.

#### I. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-9 and 14-20 Based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8-9, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenny (U.S. Pat No. 5,298,680) in view of Rutledge (U.S. Pat. No. 6,323,427).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 14 are allowable because, neither Kenny standing alone, nor in combination with Rutledge, teaches, anticipates, or suggests the present invention, as amended.

Kenny teaches a plurality of cable bundles (32, 34, and 36) enclosed in an outer jacket (17) wherein each bundle (e.g. 32) comprises two twisted pair cables (e.g. 16 and 18) which are twisted together. Kenny also teaches that each twisted pair cable in a bundle has a twist direction different from the other cable in the group to reduce EMI. (Col. 2, lines 32-34).

Also, Rutledge teaches a cable bundle with each cable pair in the bundle having different lay length from other pairs in the bundle.

Neither Kenny nor Rutledge teaches three twisted pair cables in a bundle, wherein all the cables in the bundle are twisted together in the same direction as the twists in the individual cables. Thus, Applicant submits that no combination of Kenny and Rutledge teaches, anticipates, or suggests the present invention.

II. Rejection of Independent Claim 10 Based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected independent claim 10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Donner et al (Pat Num 6,452,094) in view of Kenny (U.S. Pat No. 5,298,680).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 10 is allowable because, neither Donner standing alone, nor in combination with Kenny, teaches, anticipates, or suggests the present invention, as amended.

Applicant submits that Donner's UTP cable does not have a first twisted pair, a second twisted pair, and a third twisted pair, all twisted together in the same direction as the individual pairs to form one bundle. Donner teaches four twisted pair cables in the same bundle and no combination of the four twisted pair cables are twisted together.

In addition to the discussions above regarding Kenny, Kenny does not teach a first twisted pair, a second twisted pair, and a third twisted pair, all twisted together in the same direction as the individual pairs to form one bundle.

Therefore, Applicant submits that no combination of Donner and Kenny teaches, anticipates, or suggests the present invention.

Rejection of Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-20

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-20 being dependent upon respective allowable base claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons stated above.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

THE HECKER LAW GROUP

Date: June 08, 2005

By: 

Obi I. Iloputaife  
Reg. No. 45,677

THE HECKER LAW GROUP  
1925 Century Park East  
Suite 2300  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
(310) 286-0377

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

*This is to certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450:*

  
Signature: Frances Scardino

June 08, 2005  
Date

Appl. No. 10/800,275  
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2004

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1A, 2 and 3. These sheets, which include Fig. 1A, 2, and 3, replace the original sheets.

Attachment:            Replacement Sheets